



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/700,587	11/05/2003	Gerald C. Hurley	T3656-8786US01	7582

181 7590 05/04/2006

MILES & STOCKBRIDGE PC
1751 PINNACLE DRIVE
SUITE 500
MCLEAN, VA 22102-3833

EXAMINER

SHERMAN, STEPHEN G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2629

DATE MAILED: 05/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/700,587

Applicant(s)

HURLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen G. Sherman

Art Unit

2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 5 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of undue length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-12 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sinha et al. (US 2003/0224807).

Regarding claim 1, Sinha et al. disclose an information display system comprising:

a presentation device capable of displaying a presentation and maintaining status information (Figure 1 shows a presentation device being the projector 38,

speakers 40, wireless interface 42 and the presenter computer 12 as explained in paragraphs [0013] and [0016], and paragraph [0017] which states that this is the equipment for facilitating the presentation. The examiner understands that since the presenter computer 12 has the presentation on the display that this identifies to the user the status of where he/she is at in the presentation.);

an environmental control module adapted to adjust one or more environmental controls (Figure 1 and paragraph [0014] explain that there are controllers for controlling the lighting (28), heating/air conditioning (30), window shades (34), etc.);

a messaging system capable of receiving messages from one or more audience members (Figure 1 and paragraph [0018] explain that the audience members have microphones which allow them to send messages to the presenter, who is able to receive these messages.); and

a detachable presenter unit that is at least capable being in communication with the presentation device and is at least capable of controlling one or more functions of the presentation device (Figure 1 and paragraph [0015] explain that the presenter computer 12 is detachable from the system since it is wireless and is in communication through the wireless connection to be able to control the environmental features as explained above.).

Regarding claim 3, Sinha et al. disclose the system of claim 1, further comprising a broadcasting system that is capable of distributing the presentation to a plurality of locations (Figure 1 and paragraph [0017] explain that the audience members

each have their own notebook computer 44, which is wirelessly connected to the presentation system through their wireless device 46 such that each can receive the presentation or presentation related information on their computer.).

Regarding claim 4, Sinha et al. disclose the system of claim 1, further comprising one or more profiles that specify a particular set of environmental controls (Figure 1 and paragraph [0014] explain that each of the controllers 24 controls a different profile relating to a different environmental control such as lighting (28), heating/air conditioning (30), window shades (34), etc.).

Regarding claim 7, Sinha et al. disclose the system of claim 1, further comprising a presentation loading system adapted to receive one or more presentations from one or more of a recorded media, a wireless transmission, a wired transmission and a rehearsal booth (Figure 1 and paragraph [0016] explain that the projector 38 receives, from a wireless connection, presentation from presenter's computer 12.).

Regarding claim 8, Sinha et al. disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the presentation device comprises a primary screen and a secondary screen, the primary screen displaying a presenter view and the secondary screen displaying a presentee view (Figure 1 and paragraph [0017] explain that the presenter's computer 12 has a screen displaying a presenter view (primary screen) and that the projector or audience member's computer displays a presentee view (secondary screen).).

Regarding claim 9, Sinha et al. disclose the system of claim 1, further comprising a distributed network access device (Figure 1 shows wireless connections 42, 20, 14 and 46 which means that the system comprises a distributed network access device.).

Regarding claim 10, Sinha et al. disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the environmental controls comprise at least one of lighting controls, temperature controls, shade controls, volume controls, microphone controls, screen controls, fan controls and automated hardware controls (Figure 1 and paragraph [0014] explain that there are controllers for controlling the lighting (28), heating/air conditioning (30), window shades (34), etc.).

Regarding claim 11, Sinha et al. disclose the system of claim 1, further comprising a recording system (Paragraph [0044] states that the system may have a recording means.).

Regarding claim 12, Sinha et al. disclose the system of claim 1, wherein the environmental control module utilizes an identification scheme to identify specific environmental controls (As explained in the rejection of claim 1, the system allows for the presenter to control the lighting, temperature, etc. Paragraph [0024] then explains that the control of these functions could be automated in the presentation by the

presenter prior to giving the presentation such that the window shades may be drawn at a particular time, etc. The examiner understands that in order for the system to be able to perform this function, it would have to be able to identify the particular control that needs to be performed.).

Regarding claim 20, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 2, 14-15, 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinha et al. (US 2003/0224807) in view of Barwick (US 4,459,114).

Regarding claim 2, Sinha et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Sinha et al. fail to teach that the system further comprises a rehearsal booth that is adapted to emulate one or more functions of the information display system.

Barwick discloses a presentation system which comprises a rehearsal booth which emulates a function of a information display system (Figure 1 and column 6, lines 4-62 explain that the booth 10 can display a presentation in which the trainee can practice communicating with a target personality.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a booth as taught by Barwick for use with the presentation system as taught by Sinha et al. such that the presenter of the presentation could practice their presentation before actually performing in front of an audience in order to aide the presenter in developing a flexible verbal presentation for different audiences, problems and circumstances.

Regarding claim 14, Sinha et al. disclose a presentation method comprising:
loading a presentation (Paragraph [0016] explains that the presenter computer 12 would “load” the presentation onto the projector 38 and that this is well known in the art to do so.);

adjusting one or more environmental controls (Paragraph [0015] explains that the presenter computer 12 can be used to adjust different environmental controls.);

initializing a messaging system (Paragraph [0018] explains that audience member can send messages to the presenter, and the examiner understands the system to perform this function would have to be initialized in order to be functional.);

initializing a remote presenter unit (Figure 1 shows presenter computer 12. When this computer is turned on, it is then initialized.); and

presenting a presentation at a presentation device (Paragraph [0016] explains that the presenter computer 12 in communication with projector 38 are able to present a presentation.).

Sinha et al. fails to teach of practicing a presentation in a presentation emulation device.

Barwick discloses of practicing a presentation in a presentation emulation device (Figure 1 and column 6, lines 4-62 explain that the booth 10 can display a presentation in which the trainee can practice communicating with a target personality.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a way of practicing a presentation as taught by Barwick for use with the presentation method as taught by Sinha et al. such that the presenter of the presentation could practice their presentation before actually performing in front of an audience in order to aid the presenter in developing a flexible verbal presentation for different audiences, problems and circumstances.

Regarding claim 15, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11.

Regarding claim 17, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 9.

Regarding claim 18, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 10.

Regarding claim 19, Sinha et al. and Barwick disclose the method of claim 14.

Sinha et al. also discloses the method further comprising controlling aspects of the presentation with the remote presenter unit (Figure 1 and paragraph [0016] explain that the presenter computer 12 is wireless, i.e. remote, and that this controls the presentation.).

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinha et al. (US 2003/0224807) in view of Tafoya et al. (US 6,411,988).

Regarding claim 5, Sinha et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Sinha et al. fails to teach wherein the messaging system receives electronic messages from one or more audience members, one or more of these electronic messages being displayed in a messaging center.

Tafoya et al. disclose of a messaging system that receives electronic messages from one or more audience members, one or more of these electronic messages being displayed in a messaging center (Figures 1A-1J and column 4, line 29 to column 5, line 31 explains that audience members can send messages to a presenter, where the messages will be shown on the presenter's unit in a messaging center.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the messaging system as taught by Tafoya et al. with the system taught by Sinha et al. in order to allow for relevant feedback to be given to a presenter from the audience to help facilitate a better presentation.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinha et al. (US 2003/0224807) in view of Chaves et al. (US 2003/043110).

Regarding claim 6, Sinha et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Sinha et al. fail to teach of the system further comprising one or more of an active or passive pointing stylus.

Chaves et al. disclose of a portable device which uses a stylus (Figure 2 and paragraph [0021] explain that the stylus 238 can be used in conjunction with the system to allow the user to navigate through applications or windows easily.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a stylus as taught by Chaves et al. for use with the portable computer as taught by Sinha et al. such that a stylus could be used to provide input into the portable computer in order to allow for the more precise input of information into the presenter computer.

9. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinha et al. (US 2003/0224807) in view of Nelson et al. (US 2003/0005092).

Regarding claim 13, Sinha et al. disclose the system of claim 1.

Sinha et al. fail to teach of the system further comprising a detachable presenter locating device.

Nelson et al. disclose of a portable computer locating device (Paragraph [0018] explains that there is a system which can be used to locate a portable computer 112 connected to the internet.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the location device and method as taught by Nelson et al. with the system taught by Sinha et al. in order to allow for the location of the portable presentation device should the device be stolen or lost.

10. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinha et al. (US 2003/0224807) in view of Barwick (US 4,459,114) and further in view of Tafoya et al. (US 6,411,988).

Regarding claim 16, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 5.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Roslak et al. (US 2003/0120849) disclose a presentation system where a presenter's device can be used to control a presentation and audience member have device which can be used to provide feedback to the presenter during a presentation.

Derryberry (US 6,626,543) discloses a presentation device in which a portable computer can be removed and used remotely from the presentation device.

Fujiwara (US 2001/0003479) discloses a presentation support system which can notify a presenter of the time elapsed or time left in a presentation.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen G. Sherman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2941. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2629

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SS

27 April 2006

AMR A. AWAD
PRIMARY EXAMINER

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Amr Awad', written in a cursive style.